

PUBLIC HEARING--July 14, 1965

Appeal #8282 Kathryn C. Mayer, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on July 14, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the rear yard requirements of the R-1-B District to permit roof over existing rear porch at 3302 Loud Place, S.E., lots 65 and 66, square 5498, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) Appellant's lots have a frontage of 54.75 feet on Loud Place a width of 91.43 feet at the rear and 92.77 feet to the west and 57.05 feet to the east. The lots contains an area of 5144 square feet of land and there is a fifteen foot wide public alley at the rear and along the east side of the property.

(2) These lots are developed with a single-family detached home. There is an open porch over an existing garage 12 feet in depth and 21 feet in width. Appellant desires to erect a roof over this existing garage which will become an open porch. Appellant testified that the roof will keep rain out from her home.

(3) Appellant's dwelling meets all other requirements of the zoning regulations as to occupancy and side yard requirements.

(4) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that appellant has proven a case of hardship within the provisions of Section 8207.11 of the Zoning Regulations and that a denial of the request would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner.

We further find that appellant has provided an eight foot deep rear yard and there being a 15' public alley which makes a depth of twenty three feet to the next adjoining property over this public alley, and therefore conditions of light and air to adjoining properties will not be affected adversely.

In view of the above it is our opinion that this relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the zoning regulations and map.